

REMARKS

Election/Restrictions

On page 2 of the Office action, the Examiner identifies the following species of the claimed invention:

Species I: Fig. 1 (with a flat top surface and a plurality of hollow channels).

Species II: Fig. 7 (with a flat top surface and with no hollow channels).

Species III: Fig. 9 (with a curved flat top surface).

Species IV: Fig. 10 (with an angled top surface).

In order to expedite examination, Applicant elects without traverse, Species 1 (Fig. 1) believed to include at least claims 1-10, 15-34, and 43-47, for prosecution on the merits. If the Examiner believes that additional claims are also included in Group I, Species 1, the Examiner is respectfully requested to examine those in addition to the claims identified above.

Although Applicant makes this election without traverse, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the Restriction Requirement and examine all of the claims, if appropriate. See MPEP §803 (if the search and examination of all the claims in an application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine all of the claims on the merits, even though the claims recite independent or distinct inventions).

Conclusion

The Applicants believe that each of the pending and not withdrawn claims is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any further questions, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted electronically this 11th day of September 2008.

/Mark Trenner#43961/

Mark D. Trenner, Esq.
Registration No. 43,961
HEIMBECHER & ASSOC., LLC
Customer No. 33486
TEL: (303) 279-8888
FAX: (303) 985-0651

cc: Client
Docketing